

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-36 and 38-73 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors with respect to the reference to various drawings.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-36 and 38-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

The Examiner correctly notes that the original disclosure does illustrate and describe a connector having a plurality of locking segments and a single mandrel. Office Action, p. 2.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in the assertion that the amended independent claims recite that "each of the plurality of locking segments comprises a locking mandrel." Office Action, p. 2 (emphasis added). It is believed that a plain reading of the pending claims demonstrates that the Examiner's reading of the claims is incorrect.

As an example, amended independent claim 1 is set forth below:

1. A connector, comprising:

(2) a first end adapted to be coupled to a first component;

(3) a plurality of locking segments that, when actuated, are adapted to secure said first component to a second component, wherein each of said plurality of locking segments comprises:

a first primary locking shoulder that is adapted to engage a first surface on said first component; and

a second primary locking shoulder that is adapted to engage a second surface on said second component; and

(10) a locking mandrel that, when actuated, is adapted to engage each of said plurality of locking segments at at least three discrete, spaced apart engagement areas.

Amended independent claim 1 contains three paragraphs: paragraph 1 (line 2); paragraph 2 (lines 3-9) and paragraph 3 (lines 10-11). The second paragraph (lines 3-9) describes various aspects of the locking segments including, for example, the presence of first and second primary locking shoulders.

The third paragraph (lines 10-11) recite that the connector (from the preamble) also comprises a locking mandrel that is adapted to engage each of the plurality of locking segments.

In view of the foregoing, it is simply not understood how the Examiner reads amended claim 1 to recite that each of the plurality of locking segments comprises a locking mandrel. The other independent claims in the present application are similar to claim 1 as far as it relates to the present discussion.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 112 rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (713) 934-4055 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON  
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: December 11, 2006

/J. Mike Amerson/

J. Mike Amerson  
Reg. No. 35,426  
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(713) 934-4056  
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS